

REMARKS

Status of Claims

The Final Office Action mailed December 23, 2008, has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 stand rejected. Claims 1, 10 and 11 have been amended.

Response To Arguments

Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's comments on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, and Applicant appreciates the Examiner's explanation on the interpretation of the coordinate system, and the Examiner's suggestion for further defining an axis in the claims. Applicant has amended Claims 1, 10 and 11 to include recitation that the received light is guided "substantially in parallel to a plane of a displaying surface of the light transmissive display". Support for this amendment may be found, *inter alia*, in Figures 3 and 4.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tiao et al (US 6,318,863). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 as amended recites "the plate being adapted to receive light from the one or more light emitters, guide the received light therein substantially **in parallel to a plane of a displaying surface** of the light transmissive display". The taper light pipe 220 of Tiao does not do this. As presented in Applicant's previous Response, the figures and description of Tiao disclose that the taper light pipe 220 only transmits light in a path **orthogonal** to the light valve 230. The plate as recited by Claim 1 is entirely different from the taper light pipe 220 of Tiao, and functions in a different way. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Tiao does not disclose each and every feature of Claim 1, and this claim and all claims that depend upon it are allowable. Applicant has amended Claims 10 and 11 in a similar fashion, and asserts that these claims and all claims that depend upon them are also allowable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3, 7, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiao et al (US 6,318,863) by itself. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiao et al (US 6,318,863), in further view of Tsutsui et al (US 2001/0030571 A1). Finally, Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiao et al (US 6,318,863), in further view of Bassous et al (US 4,007,464). Applicant traverses these rejections. These claims depend on allowable parent claims, and are therefore allowable.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19, 2009

By: /David Lowry/
David D. Lowry
Registration No. 38,538
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
28 State Street, 28th Floor
Boston, MA 02109-1775
Telephone: 617-720-9600
Fax: 617-720-9601